

REMARKS

The claims have been replaced in their entirety. Whereas claim 16 recited an oligomer or a polymer and attempted to use a single formula representing both, this claim has been divided into two.

New independent claim 17 is directed to an oligomer and is based on the oligomer version of previous claim 16. The new claim uses a formula which reflects the structure of the oligomer used as the active material in the organic based device. The Applicant believes this language and structure better reflect an oligomer, and in particular reflect an oligomer including 2,7-carbazolenevinylene as one of the monomers.

New independent claim 26 is directed to a polymer and is based on the polymer version of previous claim 16. The new claim uses a formula which reflects the structure of the polymer used as the active material in the organic based device. Previous claim 16 had tried to describe a polymer and the description makes it clear that a polymer containing 2,7-carbazolenevinylene could be used as the active component within an organic device, but it was realized that the formula that was previously used does not actually describe such a polymer. Rather, the formula was far too restrictive in what kind of polymer could be used, namely one that had repetitions of exactly matching units of C_x-Z_y where C is 2,7-carbazolenevinylene. In reality, a person of ordinary skill in the art of polymer chemistry would realize that polymers could not be made that would satisfy this formula, at least for the case where $y > 0$. The applicant believes that the current language used in claim 26 is the proper way of describing the polymer used in the invention, and that a person skilled in the art reading the description as a whole would realize that this is what was intended by the polymer described in previous claim 16.

The new dependent claims match the previous dependent claims in substance, though the separation of the independent claim means that some claims are dependent on only one of the new independent claims.

No new subject matter has been added.

It should be noted that new claims 17 and 26 each describe the same inventive concept, namely the use of 2,7-carbazolenevinylene as a monomer in a chain of organic compounds as the active material in an OFET or an OPC. The two different claims are used solely as a means of describing both the oligomer embodiment and the polymer embodiment.

Turning to the substance of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 9, 12, and 16 on the grounds that various specified terms should be amended in order to avoid informalities. These claims have been deleted and it is believed that the replacement claims do not contain these informality errors.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112 on the grounds that the claim recites that the 2,7-carbazolenevinylene is RCPCR, yet RCPCR does not satisfy the formula given in previous claim 16. The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112 on the grounds that the claim recites that the 2,7-carbazolenevinylene is CPC, yet CPC does not satisfy the formula given in claim 16. The claims have been deleted, and the replacement independent claim (claim 17) on which the equivalents of previous claims 5 and 6 depend defines a structure to which RCPCR and CPC can belong. It is to be noted that part of the rejection of these claims related to specific forms of the end caps. However, neither previous claim 16 nor current claim 17 have this restriction, and both RCPCR and CPC satisfy formula I in the cases of A and B being alkyl chains and hydrogen, respectively.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 5 to 8 and 13 to 16 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting with regard to copending Application No. 10/568,303. A terminal disclaimer has been filed to overcome this provisional rejection.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 9 and 10 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting with regard to copending Application No. 10/568,303 in view of (Dutta). A terminal disclaimer has been filed to overcome this provisional rejection.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 9 and 11 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting with regard to copending Application No. 10/568,303 in view of (Geens). A terminal disclaimer has been filed to overcome this provisional rejection.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 9 and 12 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting with regard to copending Application No. 10/568,303 in view of (Tang). A terminal disclaimer has been filed to overcome this provisional rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the claims as amended herein are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and action to this end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



S. Mark Budd
Registration No. 53,880
Agent of Record

MARKS & CLERK
P.O. Box 957, Station B
Ottawa, ON K1P 5S7 (613)236-9561